



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/042,505	01/09/2002	Gary J. Cross	AUS920010952US1	6747

35525 7590 11/20/2007
IBM CORP (YA)
C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC
P.O. BOX 802333
DALLAS, TX 75380

EXAMINER

HOFFMAN, BRANDON S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2136

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

11/20/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
10042505	1/9/02	CROSS, GARY J.	AUS920010952US1

IBM CORP (YA)
C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC
P.O. BOX 802333
DALLAS, TX 75380

EXAMINER

Brandon S. Hoffman

ART UNIT	PAPER
2136	20071116

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

Appellant filed a notice of appeal and after final remarks on June 27, 2006. Examiner entered the remarks and provided an advisory action on July 7, 2006. Appellant filed an appeal brief on August 28, 2006, stating that an after final was filed and the examiner did not enter the amendment. However, as can be seen from the advisory action of July 7, 2006, examiner did enter the amendment. In response to the appeal brief of August 28, 2006, examiner sent out an examiners answer, on November 15, 2006, stating that the appellants did not file any after final amendments and that their "statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct." However, examiner missed the fact that the advisory action had entered the after final remarks by the appellant. Therefore, in summary, appellant did file after final remarks which were entered by the examiner.

NASSER MOAZZAMI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

11/19/07